

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/511,602	Applicant(s) SUGANO ET AL.	
	Examiner Erick Glass	Art Unit 2837	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Erick Glass. (3) Robert Paus.
 (2) David Martin. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 01 November 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 9, 10, 12

Identification of prior art discussed: yes. Gilmore (US 6,424,749)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed amendments to rejected claims and clarification of claim language. Specifically, we discussed tongue feedback (claim 9) and neutral range set (claim 1).

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Erick Glass
 Examiner's signature, if required